



**You have downloaded a document from
RE-BUS
repository of the University of Silesia in Katowice**

Title: Representations of major subcategories of LOVE

Author: Bogusław Bierwiazzonek

Citation style: Bierwiazzonek Bogusław. (2013). Representations of major subcategories of LOVE. W: D. Gabryś-Barker, J. Mydla (red.), "English studies at the University of Silesia: forty years on". (S. 29-48). Katowice : Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.



Uznanie autorstwa - Użycie niekomercyjne - Bez utworów zależnych Polska - Licencja ta zezwala na rozpowszechnianie, przedstawianie i wykonywanie utworu jedynie w celach niekomercyjnych oraz pod warunkiem zachowania go w oryginalnej postaci (nie tworzenia utworów zależnych).



UNIwersYTET ŚLĄSKI
W KATOWICACH



Biblioteka
Uniwersytetu Śląskiego



Ministerstwo Nauki
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

Bogusław Bierwiaczonek

Representations of Major Subcategories of LOVE

This contribution is part of Chapter 3 of my book *A Cognitive Study of the Concept of Love in English* (2002). The book is a detailed analysis of the semantics of the word love in modern English. What is unique about it is that the lexeme love is shown to be a polysemous lexical item with several distinct senses, such as EROTIC LOVE, PARENTAL LOVE (with its two subcategories MOTHERLY LOVE and FATHERLY LOVE), MAN'S LOVE OF GOD, etc., each represented as a separate cognitive model in the form of a Parallel Distributed Sub-Symbolic Representation (PDSSR), which has the overall structure of a script. The initial chapters of the book present critical discussion of other studies of LOVE in English, in particular those of Wierzbicka and Kövecses, and argue in favour of the cognitive approach to LOVE as a polysemous category. The model of representation is based on Langacker's notion of domain matrix and the theory of Parallel Distributed Processing. In subsequent chapters the differences and links as well as projections between the particular subcategories of LOVE are discussed and explained in terms of the theory of Intracategorical Projection Hypothesis. In addition, two separate chapters are devoted to the most common metonymies and metaphors of LOVE.

1. EROTIC LOVE (EL) (typical)

“And Adam said, this is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh” (Gen. 2,23—24)

“Man's original body having been thus cut in two, each half yearned for the half from which it had been severed. When they met they threw their arms round one another and embraced, in their longing to grow together again, and they perished of hunger and general neglect of their concerns, because they would not do anything apart” (Plato, *The Symposium*: Speech of Aristophanes).

“Love is always a kind of interpersonal synthesis and synchronization of preferences, passions, and kindness” (WOJTYŁA, 1986: 88)¹.

¹ „Miłość jest zawsze jakąś międzyosobową syntezą i synchronizacją upodobań, pożądań i życzliwości” [transl. Mine — B.B.].

"[Erotic love] is the craving for complete fusion, for union with one other person" (FROMM, 1985: 48)

"Romantic love is an emotion that provides a powerful bond between two people, possibly strangers, on the basis of a single readily available shared and complementary set of attributes which we sometimes lump together with the simplistic name 'sex'" (SOLOMON, 1990: 138)

"The course of true love never runs smooth" (Proverb, after Shakespeare).

It is EL that corresponds most closely to the traditional Greek *eros* and Latin *amor*. Indeed, a number of crucial aspects of love is certainly deeply rooted in those traditions and Sappho, Mimnermos, Plato's speakers in *The Symposium*, Ovid and hundreds other Roman writers would certainly easily recognize their own passion in modern British or American lovers (cf. Solomon, 1990 for illuminating discussion). Nevertheless, there is little doubt that the modern conception of LOVE was also considerably influenced by the Bible and the Christian writings as well as the medieval ideals of COURTLY LOVE (cf. DE ROUGEMONT, 1968; STARCZEWSKA, 1975), the rise of modern individualism (cf. SOLOMON, 1990), psychoanalysis (cf. MAY, 1978; GOŁASZEWSKA, 1992) and feminism (cf. SOLOMON, 1990).

STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS:

SYMMETRICAL:

GENDER OF L \neq GENDER OF OL;

L(lover): ADULT, ANY GENDER²

OL(object of love): ADULT, ANY GENDER;

Age of L INCL & PROX age of OJ};

LL(love link): EXCLUSIVE: one L & one OL

MUTUAL

TABOO: sex of L = sex of OJ;

OL: NOT ADULT;

OL: ~HUMAN

TYPICAL SCRIPT

STAGE 1. Falling in love

DOMAIN OF EMOTIONS:

L FEELS: (FOREGROUNDED): AFFECTION, ENTHUSIASM,³ INTEREST,
LONGING, SEXUAL DESIRE, ADMIRATION, PLEASURE
(BACKGROUNDED): JEALOUSY, DEVOTION, LIKING,

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES THAT OL IS THE MOST BEAUTIFUL PERSON IN
THE WORLD

L BELIEVES OL IS SPECIAL

² Notice that in the concept of HOMOSEXUAL LOVE it is not only the SCs that change but also the whole script is affect, e.g. PIVOT 2 is (still) blocked and consequently STAGE 3 is different too.

³ SOLOMON (1990: 176): "Nothing is more obvious about love than its enthusiasm."

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L WANTS TO SEE OL AS OFTEN AS POSSIBLE
 L WANTS TO BE INTIMATE WITH OL
 L WANTS TO SHARE HIS/HER THOUGHTS WITH OL
 L WANTS OL TO BE SATISFIED WITH L

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIOR:

L EXHIBITS: INCREASE IN BODY HEAT, INCREASE IN HEART
 RATE, BLUSHING, INTERFERENCE WITH ACCURATE
 PERCEPTION
 L THINKS OF OL A LOT
 L TRIES TO WIN OL'S FAVOUR
 L OFTEN GOES OUT WITH OL
 L TALKS WITH OL A LOT
 L LOOKS IN OL'S EYES A LOT
 L OFTEN HOLDS OL
 L HELPS OL WHEN OL IS IN NEED

...

PIVOT 1: BODILY &/or EMOTIONAL &/or SPIRITUAL UNITY,
 i.e. {L COINC OL}

STAGE 2: Being in love

DOMAIN OF EMOTIONS:

L & OL FEEL: (FOREGROUNDED): AFFECTION, ENTHUSIASM, INTEREST,
 SEXUAL DESIRE, RESPONSIBILITY, DEVOTION, JEALOUSY,
 PLEASURE
 (BACKGROUNDED): ATTACHMENT, ADMIRATION, LIKING,
 KINDNESS, LONGING, FRIENDSHIP, TRUST, RESPECT⁴

...

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES THAT S/HE AND OL WERE MADE FOR EACH
 OTHER
 L BELIEVES THAT THEIR LL WILL LAST FOR EVER

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L & OL WANT TO LIVE TOGETHER
 L & OL WANT TO RETAIN THEIR LL
 L & OL WANT TO MAKE EACH OTHER HAPPY⁵
 L & OL WANT TO SHARE EACH OTHER'S THOUGHTS AND
 PROBLEMS

⁴ I agree with SOLOMON (1990: 129) that "romantic love renders respect irrelevant", but if love is to continue, e.g. go beyond its romantic stage, respect must appear.

⁵ "One of my primary concerns is _'s welfare" in: RUBIN's (1970): Love Scale and "A wishes to see B's welfare promoted" in: NEWTON-SMITH's (1973) definition.

L & OL WANT TO GET MARRIED
L & OL WANT TO HAVE CHILDREN

...

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIOR:

L & OL ARE OFTEN INTIMATE⁶
L & OL OFTEN HAVE SEX⁷
L & OL CARE ABOUT EACH OTHER
L & OL SPEND A LOT OF TIME TOGETHER
L & OL TALK A LOT
L & OL OFTEN ARGUE⁸

...

PIVOT 2: Wedding and after

L & OL GET MARRIED
L & OL GO ON HONEYMOON
L & OL START LIVING TOGETHER

STAGE 3. Conjugal love

DOMAIN OF EMOTIONS:

L & OL FEEL: (FOREGROUNDED): AFFECTION, ATTACHMENT,
RESPONSIBILITY, LIKING, KINDNESS, FRIENDSHIP,
(BACKGROUNDED): INTEREST, SEXUAL DESIRE, ADMIRA-
TION, SELF-SACRIFICE, RESPECT, DEVOTION, PLEASURE

...

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L THINKS THAT THEIR LL IS GOOD
L THINKS S/HE CAN COUNT ON OL

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L & OL WANT TO LIVE TOGETHER
L & OL WANT TO RETAIN THEIR LL
L & OL WANT TO SHARE EACH OTHER'S THOUGHTS AND
PROBLEMS

...

⁶ Perhaps we should be reminded that "intimacy is not knowledge, or familiarity, or comfort" or, even less, the exchange of information," though a private talk may be. The essence of intimacy is privacy accompanied by the "breakdown of barriers and individual independence that is most commonly identified with intense sexual ecstasy and oblivion. 'Being intimate' is a generalization of that experience, and sexual activity is but one among many actions and activities that contribute to that sense of 'union'" (SOLOMON, 1990: 247). These activities include baby talk, cooing, kissing, holding, petting, etc.

⁷ As the most conspicuous expression of loving intimacy in our culture.

⁸ This particular aspect of E-lovers behavior may seem strange, but most psychologists (cf. SOLOMON, 1990; WOJCISZKE, 1993) claim that the stronger the LL is, the more likely it is that it will be accompanied by fierce arguments. Linguistically, this is borne out by the LOVE IS WAR metaphor (cf. LAKOFF and JOHNSON; 1980; KÖVECSES, 1986, 1988).

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIOR:

L & OL LIVE TOGETHER
 L & OL RAISE THEIR CHILDREN
 L & OL CARE ABOUT EACH OTHER
 L & OL ARE INTIMATE
 L & OL HAVE SEX
 L & OL SPEND TIME TOGETHER
 L & OL GO OUT TOGETHER
 L & OL TALK A LOT
 ...

1.1. Non-prototypical subcategories of EL

Non-prototypical subcategories of EL result from various modifications of the model of Typical Love. The modifications may be qualitative and/or quantitative. Qualitative modifications change some of the properties of the model, while quantitative modifications change, usually reduce, the number of elements in the model. The subcategories we discuss below are as follows: ROMANTIC LOVE⁹, PUPPY LOVE, PLATONIC LOVE, UNREQUITED LOVE, LOVE AFFAIR, TRIANGULAR LOVE, LOVE AT FIRST SIGHT, LOVE-HATE, and LOVE FOR SALE.

1.2. ROMANTIC LOVE

So much has been already written about ROMANTIC LOVE that it would be extremely difficult to try to discuss the whole huge literature. Besides, others have already done it extremely competently (cf. e.g. DE ROUGEMONT, 1968; STARCZEWSKA, 1975; SOLOMON, 1990; cf. KÖVECSES 1986, 1987; WOJCISZKE, 1993). For our purposes, what is relevant is the difference between EL and the ideal of ROMANTIC LOVE which has pervaded the European culture at least since late middle ages and defines a lot of erotic expectations even now. Since the subject is virtually boundless, we shall reduce it to two related essentials: etherealization and eternalization. Etherealization is a term suggested by SOLOMON (1990, Ch.7) to denote the Platonic version of EL, whereby LL is viewed as transcending the bodily, hence also ordinary, emotional, conditioning of its participants. ROMANTIC LOVE is viewed as

⁹ I regard *courtezia*, or COURTLY LOVE, as a thing of the past now. From the historical point of view it should be probably regarded as the medieval ancestor of the nineteenth-century ROMANTIC LOVE, hence the representation of ROMANTIC LOVE shares some of its properties, e.g. the demeaning of sexual desire, almost religious worship and devotion, propensity for self-sacrifice, fatalism, etc. (see particularly DE ROUGEMONT, 1967; STARCZEWSKA, 1975; SOLOMON, 1990, GOŁASZEWSKA, 1992).

God-given, divine. It is also “magic,” hence L’s volitional structure may be reduced to zero: everything happens by itself, miraculously. Etherealization also means that demands of everyday life, which require friendship and care, are simply irrelevant. Furthermore, the “ontological miracle” of unity (Solomon) in ROMANTIC LOVE is extremely exclusivist and, almost by definition, rules out any third party, in particular, a child. Hence, the script of EL is cut short at its climax and it is this climax, the moment of total unity, that becomes eternalized, either through, usually disastrous, marriage (institutionally) or death (existentially [sic!]). The latter solution is usually chosen by artists (most obviously in *Romeo and Juliet*, *Love Story* and *The Titanic*), probably to satisfy our attachment to this very old and deep-rooted myth, all the more attractive and appealing in the society in which most other intimate social bonds, e.g. family, friends, community, have been severed, “in a world that has made belonging an achievement rather than a presupposition” (cf. SOLOMON, 1990: 139).

The eternalization of ROMANTIC LOVE means that conceptually it is a reduced version of EL in which the stages following the climax, i.e. PIVOT 1, do not occur. The moment they occur, love ceases to be romantic. Therefore the concept is construed either as a self-contained conceptual unit, as in e.g. *Every young girl dreams of romantic love*, or as a predicate denoting the first two stages of the script of EL.

1.3. PUPPY LOVE, CALF LOVE

The main difference between full-fledged EL and puppy love lies in the relatively young age of L and OL. Other, reduced properties follow. To some extent puppy love is like romantic love: ethereal and emotional. It is unlike romantic love, however, in that it usually does not reach its full climax. Moreover, like love affair (see below), it entails its own, usually not too unhappy end: L and OL just grow out of it. Hence, although Romeo and Juliet were in their teens, we are reluctant to call their relationship puppy love.

In slang the category is also metonymically designated as *tits-and zits* (WIDAWSKI, 1998: 74).

1.4. PLATONIC LOVE

Ever since the 12th century, when the Italian celibate Ficino first used the expression *platonic love*, it has been regarded as a term denoting “worshipfulness of romantic love stripped of desire” (cf. SOLOMON, 1990: 61). Indeed, here is how it is defined in the OED: “purely spiritual, not sexual.” However, it seems clear from our representation of EL that Platonic Love is not just EL minus sexuality. The fact that sexual

desire is absent from it has serious consequences both for its related concepts and its script. Without going into details, we may just point out that it is a subcategory of love which seems to have no salient climax or Stage 4. Similarly, Stage 1 and 2 are considerably reduced in all the related domains. [...] If the paragon (cf. LAKOFF, 1987) of Platonic love are Abelard and Heloise, then we must agree with SOLOMON (1990: 73) that the term refers to “that particularly sexless and abstract emotion that may be directed *through* a person but ultimately only *to* God”.

1.5. UNREQUITED LOVE

“Even so-called ‘unrequited love’ is shared love and shared identity, if only from one side and thereby woefully incomplete. Of course, occasionally an imagined identity may be far preferable to the actuality, but even when this is the case unrequited love represents at most a hint toward a process and not the process as such. Unrequited love is still love in the sense that a sprout from an acorn is already an oak, no more, however beautiful” (SOLOMON, 1990: 146). Thus unrequited love is a love that never reaches the stage of shared identity typical of Stage 2 of EL. It is the kind of love in which LONGING and SEXUAL DESIRE never reach the point of INTIMACY. The domain of volitions is more or less the same as in Stage 1 of EL. In the domain of behavior, however, actual acts are usually replaced by Ls mere attempts do certain things with OL which OL refuses to do. Thus such elements as “L often goes out with OL” should be replaced with “L often invites or asks OL to go out, but OL usually refuses. The same goes for talking. If refusals are categorical, PIVOT 1 is never reached. If it is reached in some form, usually only physical, it usually either ends the relationship or may mark the beginning of its new stage, in which case UL becomes an unprototypical Stage 1 of EL.

1.6. LOVE AFFAIR, LIAISON

The crucial difference between EL and LOVE AFFAIR is that the latter is prototypically much shorter lived¹⁰, more sexually oriented (most dictionaries stress this aspect), and usually illicit on account of either one or both lovers being involved in another, marital relationship. The latter two elements are particularly salient in liaison. Hence both often collocate with *clandestine* –, *extramarital* –, or *on the side*. Prototypically, neither LOVE AFFAIR nor LIAISON reach PIVOT 2 and STAGE 3, but they may also denote the first two stages of EL.

¹⁰ NEWTON-SMITH (1973: 131) claims that “Love isn’t any less true for having been short-lived” but “a one-night stand” could hardly be called love, though it could, I believe, be referred to as a love affair, albeit an unprototypical one.

1.7. TRIANGULAR LOVE

Although NEWTON-SMITH (1973: 134) claims that “any move to rule out the MPLR” [i.e. multiple person love relation — BB] will be a legislative one, the very existence of the category shows that this particular LL, even if far from prototypical, is by no means uncommon, as BERGMANN (1987) has shown. If all the participants reach a workable EMOTIONAL and BEHAVIORAL agreement, TRIANGULAR LOVE may exhibit considerable overlap with the category *Ménage à trois*.

1.8. LOVE AT FIRST SIGHT

The expression, as well as a number of its variants, such as *love at first glance*, *sound*, *sentence*, or even *bite* (in G. Hamilton’s vampire spoof “Love at First Bite”) makes salient only the perceived aspect of OL which caused L to fall in love. Because of its focus, LOVE AT FIRST SIGHT should not be regarded as a separate subcategory, but a potential extension of all the other subcategories of EL. Since the perception is equated with the sudden, instantaneous onset of L’s love, it may be argued that this extension of the category of EL introduces and makes salient a new PIVOT, call it PIVOT 0, in the script of EL. Therefore it may characterize all different subcategories of EL, e.g. ROMANTIC, PUPPY LOVE or LOVE AFFAIR, regardless of their differences, including UNREQUITED LOVE, since OL’s response is unprofiled.

1.9. LOVE—HATE Relationship

The category consists of elements of two complex categories of LOVE and HATE intertwined in time. Interestingly, the category seems to be linked to the most emotionally charged subcategories of LOVE, i.e. EL, PL and CLP. Except for the domain of PEOPLE, the opposite elements of all the remaining domains tend to alternate; e.g. ADMIRATION with CONTEMPT; PRIDE with SHAME, SEXUAL DESIRE with DISGUST; L BELIEVES THAT OL IS THE MOST BEAUTIFUL PERSON IN THE WORLD with L BELIEVES THAT OL IS THE MOST UNATTRACTIVE PERSON IN THE WORLD; L WANTS OL TO BE HAPPY with L WANTS OL TO BE UNHAPPY; L WANTS TO SEE OL AS OFTEN AS POSSIBLE with L WANTS TO NEVER SEE OL AGAIN; L LOOKS IN OL’S EYES A LOT with L AVOIDS LOOKING IN OL’S EYES, etc.

The only constant elements in the domain of BEHAVIOR are probably the physiological effects, e.g. L EXHIBITS: INCREASE IN BODY HEAT, INCREASE IN HEART RATE, BLUSHING, INTERFERENCE WITH ACCURATE PERCEPTION and L THINKS OF OL A LOT. It is love, nonetheless, and should be regarded as a subcategory of LOVE, not HATE.

1.10. LOVE FOR SALE

This is an extremely degenerate category in the sense that the only element of EL active in its PDSSR is in fact SEX, which shows that it should be regarded as an extension of the category MAKE LOVE. The category is metaphorically linked, however, to other domains, in particular, the domain of FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS: LOVERS ARE PARTNERS IN A FAIR EXCHANGE OF GOODS. KNOWLEDGE: NON-PERSONAL.

Of course, psychological literature abounds in other less entrenched subcategories of LOVE such as SADISTIC, MASOCHISTIC, SADO/MASOCHISTIC, NARCISSISTIC, GENITAL, PREGENITAL, GREEK, PHALLIC, etc. (cf. GOLDENSON and ANDERSON, 1994) often discussed esp. in psychological literature. Since it would take too long to discuss all those, admittedly exciting varieties, we leave it to the reader to test the power of the present framework to represent them in a descriptively satisfying way.

2. PARENTAL LOVE (PL)

We are not going to attempt to present the model of PL as a separate subcategory, since it can simply be construed as a schematization of the two more basic models of ML and FL. We mention it only because it does function as a conventional unit. Interestingly, however, in the PDP there is no single proverb about PL, although there are quite a number of proverbs both about ML and FL.

2.1. MOTHERLY LOVE (ML)

“To a mother, a child is everything; but to a child, a parent is only a link in the chain of her existence” (Lord Beaconsfield).

“Maternal affection has always been a simile for that which is most true, self-sacrificing, constant and tender” (Louisa Lawson).

“what do girls do who haven’t any mothers to help them through their mothers” (Louisa May Alcott).

“Something to live for came to the place,
Something to die for maybe.

Something to give even a sorrow a grace,
And yet it was only a baby!” (Harriet Prescott Spofford).

“The child is always the child of the mother” (Elizabeth Jolley).

“There is only one pretty child in the world and every mother has it” (proverb).

“Years to a mother bring distress,
But do not make her love the less” (William Wordsworth).

“Motherly love by its very nature is unconditional. [...] In contrast to brotherly love and erotic love, which are love between equals, the relationship of mother to child is by its very nature one of inequality, where one needs all the help, and the other gives it” (FROMM, 1985: 40, 46).

STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS:

ASYMMETRICAL:

L: FEMALE, MUCH OLDER, ADULT, INDEPENDENT OF OL, maximally distinct from OL

OL: ANY SEX, MUCH YOUNGER, (NON-ADULT),
DEPENDENT ON L;
{age of OL INCL & ~PROX age of L}

LL: NON-EXCLUSIVE: one L, (possible) several OJ;

UNIDIRECTIONAL: from L to OL;

TABOO: SEX

STAGE 1: Pregnancy

BODILY & EMOTIONAL UNITY,

i.e. {L INCL OL}

PIVOT 1: Birth

STAGE 2: OL's infancy, childhood & adolescence

DOMAIN OF EMOTIONS:

L FEELS: (FOREGROUNDED): AFFECTION, TENDERNESS,
RESPONSIBILITY,
(BACKGROUNDED): PRIDE, DEVOTION, ENTHUSIASM,
ATTACHMENT, ADMIRATION

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES THAT OL IS THE MOST BEAUTIFUL PERSON IN
THE WORLD,

L BELIEVES OL IS SPECIAL

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L WANTS OL TO BE HAPPY

L WANTS OL TO BE SATISFIED WITH L

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIOR:

L TAKES CARE OF OL (i.e. PROVIDES FOR OL, PROTECTS
OL, TEACHES OL),

L OFTEN THINKS OF OL

L OFTEN HOLDS OL

L LOOKS IN OL'S EYES A LOT

L SACRIFICES HERSELF FOR OL

L HELPS OL WHEN OL IS IN NEED

PIVOT 2: OL leaves home¹¹

STAGE 3: OL LIVES AN INDEPENDENT LIFE

L FEELS: (FOREGROUNDED): AFFECTION, FRIENDSHIP,
(BACKGROUNDED): ATTACHMENT

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES THAT OL IS SPECIAL

L BELIEVES THAT SHE CAN COUNT ON OL WHEN SHE IS
IN NEED

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L WANTS OL TO BE HAPPY

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIOR:

L HELPS OL WHEN OL IS IN NEED

L OFTEN THINKS OF OL

Notice that the traditional theological category of LOVE OF BENEVOLENCE, “which is bestowed irrespective of the character of the object” (the OED) may have its experiential roots in ML.

2.2. FATHERLY LOVE

“No love to a father’s” (proverb).

“Mothers are a biological necessity, fathers are a social invention” (Margaret Mead).

“You don’t have to deserve your mother’s love. You have to deserve your father’s. He is more particular” (Robert Frost).

“Fatherly love is conditional love. Its principle is ‘I love you because you fulfil my expectations, because you do your duty, because you are like me’” (FROMM, 1985: 41).

STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS:

ASYMMETRICAL

L: [MALE, MUCH OLDER, ADULT, INDEPENDENT OF OL] maximally
distinct from OL

OL: [ANY SEX, MUCH YOUNGER, (NON-ADULT),
DEPENDENT ON L]; {age of OL INCL & ~PROX age of L}

LL: NON-EXCLUSIVE: one L, (possible) several OLs;

UNIDIRECTIONAL: from L to OL;

begins as BODILY & EMOTIONAL CLOSENESS, i.e. {L PROX OL}

¹¹ One of the interesting differences between the West and countries like Poland might be that while in Poland children usually do not leave home until they get married (although the pattern seems fast changing), in the West they leave as soon as they become independent.

STAGE 1: OL's infancy, childhood & adolescence

DOMAIN OF EMOTIONS:

L FEELS: (FOREGROUNDED): AFFECTION, RESPONSIBILITY, PRIDE,
INTEREST

(BACKGROUNDED): TENDERNESS, ATTACHMENT

TABOO: SEX, SEXUAL DESIRE, JEALOUSY

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES THAT OL IS SPECIAL

L HOPES THAT OL WILL BE SUCCESSFUL

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L WANTS OL TO BE HAPPY

L WANTS OL TO EXCEL AND TO SUCCEED

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIOR:

L PUNISHES and REWARDS OL

L TAKES CARE OF OL (i.e. PROVIDES FOR OL, PROTECTS
OL, TEACHES OL),

L THINKS OF OL A LOT

L SACRIFICES HIMSELF FOR OL

L HELPS OL WHEN OL IS IN NEED

TABOO: SEX, SEXUAL DESIRE, JEALOUSY(?);

PIVOT 2: OL leaves home¹²

STAGE 2: OL LIVES AN INDEPENDENT LIFE

L FEELS: (FOREGROUNDED): AFFECTION, INTEREST, PRIDE
(BACKGROUNDED): ATTACHMENT, FRIENDSHIP

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES THAT OL IS SPECIAL

L BELIEVES THAT HE CAN COUNT ON OJ WHEN HE IS IN
NEED

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L WANTS OL TO BE RESPECTED, ADMIRED

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIOR:

L HELPS OL WHEN OL IS IN NEED

L THINKS OF OL A LOT

Notice that the theological category of LOVE OF COMPLACENCY, "which implies approval of qualities in the object" (the OED), can have its experiential source in PL, which, as Fromm observed, is conditional.

¹² One of the interesting differences between the West and countries like Poland might be that while in Poland children usually do not leave home until they get married, in the West they leave as soon as they become independent. The model, however, seems to be changing, cf. Staying home with mamma. *Newsweek*, August 14(2000).

3. CHILD'S LOVE OF PARENT

STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS:

Asymmetrical

L: [ANY GENDER, MUCH YOUNGER] maximally distinct from OL

OL: [ANY SEX, MUCH OLDER, ADULT),
{age of OL INCL & ~PROX age of L}

LL: nearly EXCLUSIVE: one or two OLs;

UNIDIRECTIONAL: from L to OL;

begins as BODILY & EMOTIONAL CLOSENESS, i.e. {L PROX OL}

STAGE 1: L's infancy, childhood & adolescence

DOMAIN OF EMOTIONS:

L FEELS: (FOREGROUNDED): AFFECTION, TRUST, ADMIRATION,
RESPECT, PRIDE;

BACKGROUNDED: TENDERNESS, ATTACHMENT

TABOO: SEX, SEXUAL DESIRE, JEALOUSY

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES THAT OL IS SPECIAL

L BELIEVES THAT S/HE CAN COUNT ON OL WHEN S/HE
IS IN NEED

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L WANTS OL TO BE HAPPY

L WANTS OL TO BE SATISFIED WITH L

L WANTS OL TO BE RESPECTED, ADMIRED

L WANTS TO SHARE HIS/HER THOUGHTS WITH OL

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIOR:

L TRIES TO WIN OL'S FAVOR

L OBEYS OL

PIVOT: L leaves home

STAGE 2: OL LIVES AN INDEPENDENT LIFE

L FEELS: (FOREGROUNDED): AFFECTION, INTEREST, PRIDE,
RESPONSIBILITY, LIKING

(BACKGROUNDED): ATTACHMENT, FRIENDSHIP, DEVO-
TION

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES OL IS SPECIAL

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L WANTS OL TO BE HAPPY

L WANTS OL TO BE RESPECTED, ADMIRED

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIOR:

L HELPS OL WHEN OL IS IN NEED

L OFTEN THINKS OF OL

L TAKES CARE OF OL (i. e. PROVIDES FOR OL, LOOKS AFTER OL),

L SACRIFICES HIMSELF FOR OL

4. BROTHERLY LOVE¹³

“Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” (Matthew, 22.39).

“Love your enemies” (Matthew, 5.44).

“Love suffers long and is kind; love does not envy; love does not parade itself, is not puffed up; does not behave rudely, does not seek its own, is not provoked, thinks no evil; [...] bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things. Love never fails” (1 Corinthians, 13).

STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS:

NEAR-SYMMETRICAL¹⁴:

L: ADULT HUMAN, INDEPENDENT OF OL

OL: HUMAN

LL: EGALITARIAN: one L, (possible) hundreds of OL

COMMANDED

KNOWLEDGE: NON-PERSONAL.

DOMAIN OF EMOTIONS:

L FEELS:(FOREGROUNDED): LIKING, INTEREST, RESPECT

(BACKGROUNDED): COMPASSION¹⁵, DEVOTION, RESPONSIBILITY, FRIENDSHIP

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES THAT OL IS SPECIAL

¹³ I am aware of the unfortunate “sexist” undertones of this label, but I am simply following Fromm’s familiar terminology. As far as I am concerned, the term is perfectly neutral and applies to both genders; “sisterly” is just much less entrenched.

¹⁴ It seems that OL in BL is close to L in age, although the range is much broader than in EL. There might be a cline from BL to PL in the sense that the younger the OL is the more likely it is that L’s attitude will be characterized as ML or FL rather than BL.

¹⁵ It will be remembered that the good Samaritan “had compassion” (Luke, 10,34). It is also interesting to compare St Paul’s words, quoted above, with one of the Buddhist texts: “When the reasoning mind no longer clings and grasps, ... one awakens into the wisdom with which one was born, and compassionate energy arises without pretense” (TRUNGPA, after VARELA et al., 1997: 249). Thus compassion might be the Buddhist counterpart of the concept of Christian love as the ultimate goal and reality.

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L WANTS OL TO BE HAPPY

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIORS:

L HELPS OL WHEN OL IS IN NEED

5. MAN'S LOVE OF GOD¹⁶

"Give ear to my words, O Lord, consider my meditation. Harken unto the voice of my cry, my King, and my God: for unto thee will I pray. My voice shalt thou hear in the morning, O Lord; in the morning will I direct my prayer unto thee, and will look up" (Psalm 5).

"As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God?" (Psalm 42).

"O give thanks unto the Lord; call upon his name: make known his deeds among the people. [...] Seek the Lord, and his strength: seek his strength evermore" (Psalm 105).

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind" (Matthew, 22.37).

"If ye love me, keep my commandments" (John, 14.15).

"Our life of contemplation is simply [...] to be constantly available to him [=God], loving him with our whole heart, whole mind, whole soul, and whole strength, no matter in what form he may come to us";

"Jesus is my God.

Jesus is my spouse.

Jesus is my life.

Jesus is my only love. [...]

I have given him all, even my sins, and he has espoused me to himself in all tenderness and love.

Now and for life I am the spouse of my crucified Spouse. Amen"

(MOTHER TERESA, 1987: 115, 129).

STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS:

Extreme ASYMMETRY

L: NON-INFANT HUMAN

OL: GOD;

L maximally DEPENDENT ON OL; {OL INCL L}

¹⁶ For a more in-depth discussion of the two subcategories of RELIGIOUS LOVE, see my paper BIERWIAZONEK (2000).

LL: COMMON, EXCLUSIVE: (possible) millions of L, one OL

UNIDIRECTIONAL: from L to OL¹⁷

TABOO: GODLESSNESS, BLASPHEMY, IDOLATRY

COMMANDED

PIVOT 1: Baptism/Conversion

STAGE 1: All life/Rest of life

DOMAIN OF EMOTIONS:

L FEELS: (FOREGROUNDED): ADMIRATION, DEVOTION, ENTHUSIASM,
GRATITUDE

(BACKGROUNDED): INTEREST, TRUST, LONGING

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES THAT OL EXISTS

L BELIEVES THAT S/HE CAN COUNT ON OL WHEN S/HE IS IN NEED

L BELIEVES THAT THEIR LL WILL LAST FOR EVER

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L WANTS TO SERVE OL

L WANTS OL TO BE SATISFIED WITH L

L WANTS OL TO BE RESPECTED, ADMIRER

L WANTS TO SHARE HIS/HER THOUGHTS WITH OL

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIORS:

L THINKS OF OL A LOT

L WORSHIPS OL

L OBEYS OL

PIVOT 2: MYSTICAL UNION/DEATH

In the case PIVOT 2 being construed as MYSTICAL UNION the whole STAGE 1 may be repeated indefinite number of times as part of the religious scenario consisting of purification, illumination and identification with God

6. GOD'S LOVE OF MAN

The attribution of such distinctly human characteristics as EMOTIONS and VOLITIONS to God presupposes a prior personification. We claim therefore that the characterization of GLM in terms of these two characteristics involves a prior mapping from the domain of TRANSCENDENT BEINGS to the domain of

¹⁷ The MUTUAL construal is possible when it is assumed that God always loves people, i.e. God's love is "evangelical" in the sense of TISCHNER (1993). MOTHER TERESA (1987: 56) characterizes the mutual nature of the relation as follows:

"I for God, God for me. [...] There is no limit to God's love. It is without measure and its depth cannot be sounded. [...] Now turn the same picture around. There must be no limit to the love that prompts us to give ourselves to God [...]."

PEOPLE. Of course the fact that Jesus is considered God who became man makes the mapping almost “factual” rather than metaphoric. However, the mapping does not seem total, e.g. in the domain of BEHAVIOURS the believers seem to expect from God much more than from ordinary people. Nor do we expect His thinking to be comparable to ours, although Jesus’ stories (c.f. e.g. Luke 15.4—10) make it clear that each of us is SPECIAL to God. Therefore in the diagram at the end of this Chapter we shall retain the conceptually double ontological status of God as belonging both to the domain of TRANSCENDENT BEINGS and PEOPLE and bear in mind that most of the elements ascribed to Him make sense only after the personification.

“Thy mercy, O Lord, is in the heavens; and thy faithfulness reacheth unto the clouds. Thy righteousness is like the great mountains; thy judgments are a great deep: O Lord, thou preservest man and beast. How excellent is thy loving kindness. O God! therefore the children of men put their trust under the shadow of thy wings. They shall be abundantly satisfied with the fatness of thy house; and thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures” (Psalm 36).

“The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works. [...] The Lord upholdeth all that fall, and raises up all those that be bowed down. [...] Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing” (Psalm 145).

“The Lord preserveth all them that love him; but all the wicked will he destroy” (Ps.145.20).: “And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children’s children, unto the third and to the fourth generation” (Exodus, 34.6—7).

“Wen Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt. [...] I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms; but they knew not that I healed them. I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love: and I was to them as they that take off the yoke on their jaws, and I laid meat unto them. [...] How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee, Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zaboim? mine heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together. I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim: for I am God, and not man; the hole one in the midst of thee: and I will not enter into the city” (Hosea, 11.1—9).

“Don’t be afraid of the just God. His Justice is as admirable and as gentle as His Mercy; both are evidence of Love” (ECRIVÁ DE BALAGUER, 1986: 91).

“In the name of love, God humbles himself completely, offering his love to everyone” (Mark 10.45, 1Tim. 2.6).

“God is but Love, and there so am I”

“I am surrounded by the Love of God” (*A Course in Miracles*, Lessons 171 & 264).

STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS:

Extreme ASYMMETRY

L: GOD

OL: HUMAN

OL maximally DEPENDENT ON L; {L INCL OL}

LL: EGALITARIAN: (possible) millions of OL, one L

UNIDIRECTIONAL: from L to OL

DOMAIN OF EMOTIONS:

L FEELS: (FOREGROUNDED): AFFECTION, INTEREST, RESPONSIBILITY,
(BACKGROUNDED): TENDERNESS, COMPASSION, RESPECT

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES THAT OL IS SPECIAL

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L WANTS OL TO BE HAPPY

L WANTS OL TO EXCEL AND TO SUCCEED

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIORS:

L HELPS OL WHEN OL IS IN NEED

L SACRIFICES HIMSELF FOR OL

L PUNISHES AND REWARDS OL

L TAKES CARE OF OL (i.e. HELPS OL, PROVIDES FOR OL, PROTECTS
OL, TEACHES OL, etc.)**7. SELF-LOVE**

self-love: 1. selfishness, self-indulgence. 2. Philos. regard for one's own well-being and happiness (OEED).

self-love: Egoism in its emotional aspect; narcissism (DREVER, 1982).

"Selfishness and self-love, far from being identical, are actually opposites" (FROMM, 1985).

"If you love yourself, you love everybody else as you do yourself" (Meister ECKHART).

STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS:

SYMMETRICAL

L = OL

L/OL: (NON-INFANT?) HUMAN

LL: MAXIMALLY EXCLUSIVE: one L/OL; i.e. {L COINC OL}

MAXIMALLY MUTUAL: from L to OL = from OL to L

TABOO: SEX (masturbation)

DOMAIN OF EMOTIONS:

L FEELS: (FOREGROUNDED): INTEREST, LIKING, RESPECT
(BACKGROUNDED): RESPONSIBILITY

DOMAIN OF PROPOSITIONAL ATTITUDES:

L BELIEVES THAT OL IS SPECIAL

L HOPES THAT OL WILL BE SUCCESSFUL

DOMAIN OF VOLITIONS:

L WANTS OL TO BE HAPPY

L WANTS OL TO EXCEL AND TO SUCCEED

DOMAIN OF BEHAVIORS:

L TAKES CARE OF OL (i.e. PROVIDES FOR OL, PROTECTS OL,
TEACHES OL, etc.)

References

- BERGMANN, M.S. (1987): *The Anatomy of Loving*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- BIERWIAZONEK, B. (2000): "Religijne subkategorie miłości." In: NOWAKOWSKA-KEMPNA, I., DĄBROWSKA A. and ANUSIEWICZ J. (eds.): *Uczucia w języku i tekście*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 79—117 ("Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis", Seria: *Język a kultura*, T. 14).
- DREVER, J. (1982): *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology*. Penguin Books.
- ESCRIVÁ DE BALAGUERY ALBÁS, J. (1986): *Droga*. [Przeł. J. JARCO], Katowice: KŚJ.
- FROMM, E. (1985 [1957]): *The Art of Loving*. London: Mandala.
- GOLDENSON, R. and K. ANDERSON. (1994): *Dictionary of Sex*. Bloomsbury Publishing Limited.
- GOŁASZEWSKA, M. (1992): *Imiona miłości*. Kraków: Universitas.
- KOVECSES, Z. (1986): *Metaphors of Anger, Pride, and Love: A Lexical Approach to the Structure of Concepts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- KÖVECSES, Z. (1988). *The Language of Love. The Semantics of Passion in Conversational English*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.
- LAKOFF, G. (1987): *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LAKOFF, G. and JOHNSON M. (1980): *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MOTHER TERESA (1986): *Jesus, The Word to Be Spoken*. London: Collins.
- NEWTON-SMITH, W. (1973): "A conceptual investigation of love." In: MONTEFIORE A. (ed.): *Philosophy and Personal Relations*. McGill-Queen's University Press, 113—136.
- ROUGEMONT, D. DE (1968): *Miłość a świat kultury zachodniej*. Przeł. L. EUSTACHIEWICZ. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX.
- RUBIN, Z. (1970): "Measurement of romantic love." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 16, 265—273.
- SOLOMON, R. (1990): *Love: Emotion, Myth & Metaphor*. Buffalo. New York: Prometheus Books.

- STARCZEWSKA, K. (1975): *Wzory miłości w kulturze Zachodu*. Warszawa: PIW.
- TISCHNER, J. (1993). *Miłość niemiłowana*. Kraków: WSG.
- VARELA, F., THOMPSON E. and ROSCH E. (1997): *The Embodied Mind. Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- WOJCISZKE, B. (1993): *Psychologia miłości: intymność, namiętność, zaangażowanie*. Gdańsk: GWP Marabut.
- WOJTYŁA, K. (1986 [1960]): *Miłość i odpowiedzialność*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego KUL.

Source

- BIERWIAZONEK, B., (2002): *A Cognitive Study of the Concept of Love in English*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 85—103.